

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/509,265	MICHELSON ET AL.	

  

<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
Scott J. Sugarman	2873	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(1) Scott J. Sugarman.

(3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Mr Levoritz.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 18 March 2008

**Time:** 17:00

**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*NONE*

Claims discussed:

9-21

Prior art documents discussed:

*NONE*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner indicated that claim 18 of the amendment of 12-13-06 was inadvertently missing in the amendment of 12-26-07. Examiner suggested doing an Examiner's Amendment listing all of the pending claims (including the claims added by amendment on 12-26-07) and the Attorney agreed. In addition to listing claims 9-21, the Examiner corrected a minor typo in Claim 17.